PATENT COOPERATION TREATY



PCT



INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

REC'D 04 DEC 2003

1		
ı	MIDO	Pat
ı	WT 1 4 8	

Applicant's or agent's file reference 1094WOORD01 FOR FURTHER ACT				FOR FURTHER ACTION	See Notification Preliminary Ex	n of Transmittal of International amination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No. International filling date (PCT/EP03/01876 25.02.2003			International filing date (day/mil) 25.02.2003	onth/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 06.03.2002		
Inter	nationa	l Pate	nt Classification (IPC) or bo	th national classification and IPC			
	K31/4		···· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	licant						
ALT	ΓΑΝΑ	PHA	RMA AG et al.		•		
1.	 This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36. 						
2.	Thie	BEP	OBT consists of a total o	of 5 sheets, including this co	ver sheet.	•	
٠.	11113	1111	of the consists of a total t	of Chicoto, moldaning and Co			
		This	report is also accompa	nied by ANNEXES, i.e. sheet	s of the descripti	on, claims and/or drawings which have	
		beer	n amended and are the	basis for this report and/or sh n 607 of the Administrative In	eets containing i	ectifications made before this Authority	
}		(See	nule 70. To and Section	1007 of the Administrative in			
İ	Thes	e anı	nexes consist of a total of	of sheets.			
			·				
				•			
3.	This	repo	rt contains indications re	lating to the following items:	~ -		
	ı	\boxtimes	Basis of the opinion				
	li		Priority				
	10	×	•	opinion with regard to novelt	, inventive step	and industrial applicability	
	IV		Lack of unity of invent		•		
	٧	×	Reasoned statement		gard to novelty, it	nventive step or industrial applicability;	
}	Vi		Certain documents cit	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	VII			international application			
	VIII			on the international application	n		
			3314III 33001 74II3110 (mineriane in melengania			
Date of submission of the demand Date of completion of this report			this report				
Date	Date of submission of the demand			Dat	a or completion of	ina tahoit	
	00.00.000				10.0000		
20.	20.09.2003			. 03.	12.2003		
No	Name and mailing address of the international			nal Διιt	norized Officer		
prel	preliminary examining authority:			Tut.		LEGISCOW MICHAEL	
European Patent Office D-80298 Munich			Ci-	del, U			
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d			356 epmu d				
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465			Tel	ephone No. +49 89	2399-7064 - The Park of the Pa		



INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/EP03/01876

l.	Basis	of the	report
----	-------	--------	--------

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17)):

	Desc	cription, Pages						
	1-57	•	as originally filed					
	Clair	ns, Numbers						
	1-47	•	as originally filed					
			- '					
2.	With lange	With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.						
	These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:							
		the language of a trai	nslation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).					
		the language of public	cation of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).					
		the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).						
3.	otide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:							
		contained in the inter	national application in written form.					
	_		e international application in computer readable form.					
			tly to this Authority in written form.					
		furnished subsequen	ntly to this Authority in computer readable form.					
☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go b in the international application as filed has been furnished.			he subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure pplication as filed has been furnished.					
		to the written sequence						
4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:								
		the description,	pages:					
		the claims,	Nos.:					
		the drawings,	sheets:					
5	. □	been considered to	n established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).					
		(Any replacement si report.)	heet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this					
6	. Ad	ditional observations,	if necessary:					



INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/EP03/01876

					y, inventive step and industrial applicability	
1.	The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non-obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:					
		1 the entire international application,				
	⊠	claims Nos. 35-38				
		because:				
	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):			s Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does n (specify):		
see separate sheet						
		the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):				
		the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.				
		\square no international search report has been established for the said claims Nos.				
2.	am	A meaningful international preliminary examination cannot be carried out due to the failure of the nucleotide and amino acid sequence listing to comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative instructions:				
		the written form has not been f	urnish	ed or does n	ot comply with the Standard.	
		the computer readable form ha	as not l	been furnish	ed or does not comply with the Standard.	
V	 V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement 					
1	. Sta	Statement				
	No	ovelty (N)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	7-14, 19-27, 30-34 (YES) 1-6, 15-18, 28, 29,35 (NO)	
	in	ventive step (IS)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-47 (NO)	
	In	dustrial applicability (IA)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-34,·39-47 (YES)	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

<u>Item III</u>

Claims 35-38 relate to subject-matter considered by this Authority to be covered by the provisions of Rule 67.1(iv) PCT. Consequently, no opinion will be formulated with respect to the industrial applicability of the subject-matter of these claims (Article 34(4)(a)(i) PCT).

Item V

1. Reference is made to the documents cited in the search report. They are numbered accordingly.

2. Novelty

The subject matter of claims 1-6, 15-18, 28, 29 and 35 is not regarded as new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

D1 already discloses a pharmaceutical composition comprising a PDE4 inhibitor (nimesulide) and a histamine (H1) receptor antagonist (cetirizine dihydrochloride) in a tablet (see page 3, lines 57-58; page 4, lines 16-18 and lines 26-29 as well as example I) which is used for the treatment of allergic disorders like rhinitis, bronchitis and asthma (see page 2, lines 10-11). As first production step of this tablet, the mixing of the active ingredients is mentioned (see example I). Hence, the subject matter of claims 1-6, 15- 18 and 35 is not new.

D2 also describes a combination of a histamine (H1) receptor antagonist (here: terfenadine) with nimesulide (PDE4-inhibitor - see D1) for the treatment of allergic rhinitis (see summary). Nimesulide and terfenadine were applied separately by giving two tablets to the group of patients (see page 314, 1st column, last paragraph). Hence, the subject matter of claims 1-3, 17-18, 28-29 and 35 is not new.

3. Inventive step

The present application does not meet the requirements of Article 52(1) EPC, because the subject-matter of claims 1-47 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 56 EPC.

Closest prior art is D1 which discloses a composition comprising a PDE4-inhibitor and a histamine H1 receptor antagonist for the treatment of allergic disorders like rhinitis, bronchitis and asthma (see page 2, lines 5-11).

The problem underlying the present application in view of the prior art is therefore the provision of a superior composition for the same purpose.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY Inte

The solution presented by the applicant can not be regarded as being inventive since it is just a combination of well-known active compounds from the classes of PDE4- or PDE3/4- inhibitors and histamine H1 receptor antagonists.

D4: loratadine is a H-1 histamine receptor antagonist which is effective in treating allergic rhinitis and asthma (see column 1, lines 16-22 and lines 54-63).

D5: roflumilast is a selective PDE4-inhibitor which can be used in the manufacture of a medicament for the treatment of chronic inflammatory disorders such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (see abstract).

D6: tetrahydro-2H-phtalazine-1-one derivatives are effective PDE4-inhibitors for the treatment of disorders of the respiratory tract (see examples 1-10, page 17, paragraph 6 and page 18, first paragraph).

Consequently, in the absence of any surprising effect, the subject matter of claims 1-47 does not involve an inventive step.

4. Industrial applicability

For the assessment of the present claims 35-38 on the question whether they are industrially applicable, no unified criteria exist in the PCT Contracting States. The patentability can also be dependent upon the formulation of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognize as industrially applicable the subject-matter of claims to the use of a compound in medical treatment, but may allow, however, claims to a known compound for first use in medical treatment and the use of such a compound for the manufacture of a medicament for a new medical treatment.